Case 1:14-cv-02836-WHP Document 33 Filed 07/30/14 Page 1 of 11

e7i2flec UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 In re: New York, N.Y. Fletcher International, Ltd. 4 14 Cv. 2836(WHP) 5 6 July 18, 2014 2:50 p.m. 7 Before: 8 HON. WILLIAM H. PAULEY III, 9 District Judge 10 11 **APPEARANCES** 12 13 STEWART TURNER Pro Se Appellant 14 15 ALPHONSE FLETCHER, JR. (via telephone) Pro Se Appellant 16 17 LUSKIN, STERN & EISLER, LLP Attorneys for Appellee Richard J. Davis, Trustee 18 BY: MICHAEL LUSKIN 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 (In the robing room) 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge Pauley. You are on a speakerphone in my robing room and a court 3 4 reporter is present, recording what is being said. 5 Are you there? 6 MR. FLETCHER: I am. Good afternoon. 7 THE COURT: Would you give us your name for the 8 benefit of the court reporter. 9 MR. FLETCHER: This is Alphonse Fletcher, Jr. 10 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Fletcher. 11 I am joined by the appellant. 12 MR. TURNER: Stewart Turner, for the record. 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Turner. 14 MR. TURNER: Good afternoon. 15 THE COURT: And counsel for the estate. 16 MR. LUSKIN: Michael Luskin, Luskin, Stern & Eisler, 17 for the Chapter 11 trustee. THE COURT: I have before me Mr. Luskin's letter 18 19 seeking leave to make a motion to require appellant to post a 20 bond in this case. 21 Have you seen the letter, Mr. Turner? 22 MR. TURNER: Yes, I have. 23 THE COURT: Do you want to submit a letter or shall I 24 simply fix a motion schedule? 25

MR. TURNER: I thought we were going to discuss it

today, but I am happy to prepare a motion.

THE COURT: I am glad to discuss it also, if we can endeavor to resolve it.

MR. TURNER: Okay. May I proceed?

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

MR. TURNER: I don't believe that a bond should be part of this. I am not requesting a stay. I have never requested a stay. But the agreement itself calls for the closing date to be 14 days after the latest stay of appeal, so I believe bonds have to be put up in regard to requesting a stay, but the document, the agreement between Fletcher International Ltd., under trustee Davis, and United itself has a contractual provision in it that would not require a bond because a stay is not required.

THE COURT: Mr. Luskin, do you want to respond?

MR. LUSKIN: On that, just very briefly. The kind of bond that Mr. Turner is talking about is a supersedeas bond.

That's not the issue here. This is a prospective-looking bond under appellate --

THE COURT: Keep your voice up.

MR. LUSKIN: -- under Federal Rule of Appellate

Procedure 7, which is a forward-looking rule to impose costs.

And, frankly, I think that the difficult issue that I have

presented to your Honor or would on a motion if we can't

proceed just on the basis of the letters, which I am happy to

do, is whether or not Rule 38 damages, which would include attorney's fees for a meritless appeal, should be awarded. Your Honor has written on that. There are other cases. There is a Second Circuit case. I am prepared to argue those. But I don't know that we are all prepared to do that today.

I do think that both of these appeals -Mr. Fletcher's and Mr. Turner's -- involve discretionary
matters that were relegated first to the discretion of the
trustee, then to the discretion of the bankruptcy court. Your
Honor reviewed both decisions for abuse of discretion or clear
error to the extent there were fact findings.

This is not a case like the Currency Conversion case or Adsani, for that matter, because these decisions have already been reviewed once. You are sitting as an appellate court. You have probably the best position of anyone to know whether or not there is merit to these appeals. I know, again, in Currency Conversion, you wrote that that was really a question for the Court of Appeals, but I think in this case, respectfully, I would ask that you exercise your discretion in favor of assessing the merits of these appeals, determining that, if you find them meritless, sanctions are likely to be assessed, that they be included as Rule 38 costs, which can be included in Rule 7 costs.

So that's really the entirety of my argument. The rest is detail. This is not a bond seeking a stay. The

supersedeas bond, the kind of bond Mr. Turner is talking about, is one he would seek if he was seeking a stay. We don't need a stay here.

MR. TURNER: I believe that there are some errors.

One thing that Mr. Luskin said that I do agree, you may be, unfortunately, in the best position to decide because you have seen things that Judge Gerber has not seen, although you have not seen everything, or at least I haven't seen everything.

When we were in the courtroom in May, Mr. Luskin had said that Judge Gerber had used the term "recombination" in a case to mean reverse stock split. He also called it a term of art. I am not aware, and I am in this business, I am not aware of "recombination" as a term of art in reference to a reverse stock split. It is referenced to combining deals, as mergers between companies. Sprint a couple of years ago had its regular stock and a tracking stock, PCS, and at some point you might call it a one-for-two reverse split, but the PCS shares were converted into FON shares.

There is another case, I have done QRCP and turned it into PSTR, a handful of cases with the word "recombination."

A Westlaw search for Judge Gerber and the word "recombination" didn't find anything. I couldn't find anything for it on Google. At the very least I would like to see Judge Gerber's unpublished decision before we rule. I believe it impacted your decision, as you said in a footnote at the bottom

of page 2 of your ruling, that both the trustee and UCBI believe "recombination" means "reverse stock split." I have other cases where the word "recombination" doesn't mean "reverse stock split." It could be a stock split, reverse stock split, a recombination, or something else.

I think that issue needs to be explored further.

THE COURT: Do you want to make any submission to me?

If I treat Mr. Luskin's letter as the application for the

posting of a bond -- and I am prepared to do that -- if you

wish to submit a letter or some memorandum to me in opposition

to that, I will permit it, and then I will decide the question.

MR. TURNER: It sounds like I should, because otherwise there is one letter for him and no letter for me.

THE COURT: It would be helpful.

MR. TURNER: Okay. If it would be helpful, then I am happy to do so, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will place one question in front of you now that you can answer now or answer in your letter, but do you have available to you some financial resources to post some sort of bond with respect to the appeal if I were to require it?

MR. TURNER: Not in the amount of \$50,000. I could put up a \$500 bond. I don't really have any more, and that would actually be a stretch.

THE COURT: When do you want to submit a letter to me?

And you can do it in the form of a letter if you would like, 1 2 addressing the four factors that Mr. Luskin has outlined in his 3 letter application. 4 MR. TURNER: I would have to review the cases closely 5 as well. Is two weeks acceptable, your Honor? 6 THE COURT: Do you have any problem with that? 7 MR. LUSKIN: Your Honor, I do only because this is holding up a closing. Chambers rules did require him to file a 8 9 letter a week ago. He didn't do that. He has had my letter 10 for two or three weeks now, and I just --11 THE COURT: How about filing a letter response by next 12 Friday, July 25? 13 MR. TURNER: I will do so, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right? And I will decide the matter 15 promptly. 16 MR. TURNER: May I include attachments? Or --17 It is really not an evidentiary matter, THE COURT: 18 and it is not an opportunity for reargument of the case. You 19 need to address yourself to the factors that are set forth in 20 Mr. Luskin's letter with respect to the appeal, and they are 21 also set forth in my decision in Currency Conversion, which is 22 cited in his letter.

decision that he -
MR. LUSKIN: I'm not sure what he is referring to.

MR. TURNER: May I have a copy of the Judge Gerber

23

24

25

MR. TURNER: The one you referred to in court where --

MR. LUSKIN: I heard you, but --

MR. TURNER: -- "recombination" means "reverse stock split."

THE COURT: The court reporter can only take one voice at a time, and both of you will address your remarks to the court.

Are we going to be following the same procedure with respect to Mr. Fletcher? Mr. Fletcher, do you want to be heard?

MR. FLETCHER: First, I would like to submit a letter prior to you making a decision, your Honor, if I may.

THE COURT: You may do so by next Friday, July 25.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you. I will do that.

The only other thing that I would add is that I believe the general picture perhaps has been missing from these proceedings. I will try to address the specific issues that are called for by Mr. Luskin's letter and those cases, but it is also interesting that it reflects back on the case generally; and I think in the absence of that information, it is difficult for the court to -- I just think that information is helpful to the court in reaching its ultimate decision.

While Mr. Turner has excellent points and is very knowledgeable about these issues and I believe correct, getting buried in what recombinations are versus recapitalizations versus reverse

stock splits could lead to the right answer, but it seems like a difficult task to try to bring to the court.

I think the answer is more easily found in the fact that the court and the system relies on these fiduciaries to be disinterested and to maximize the value of the estate. To the extent they are, they are given great latitude. But in this case, despite the fundamental tenets of the Bankruptcy Code, despite the key factor in TNT, the arm's length negotiations, all those things are wrong in this case and the net effect has been to impair our ability to bring facts to the court. I believe that creates the excusable neglect that we have seen, and I think if all those facts are properly presented to the court, this settlement will be, at a minimum, reviewed more carefully; if not —

THE COURT: Your colloquy to the court just now suggests to me a misapprehension about what the proceeding is that is before me, which is an application by the estate to require you and Mr. Turner, as appellants, to post a bond and there are four factors involved. They are set forth quite clearly in Mr. Luskin's letter, and that is the matter on which I am inviting a submission. I have decided the appeal, and this is not an invitation to relitigate the appeal. So please keep that in mind.

Mr. Luskin, if you feel the need to submit anything further based upon what either Mr. Fletcher or Mr. Turner

submit to me next Friday, please do so by Tuesday, July 29. 1 2 MR. LUSKIN: I will do that, your Honor. May I do it in a single letter? I know technically we have two appeals. 3 4 THE COURT: You can do it in a single letter. 5 MR. LUSKIN: I will do that. If need be, that's what I will do. 6 7 THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. Anything further? MR. FLETCHER: Your Honor, no. I would just say I 8 understand the point you were making, and I will stick to that. 9 10 Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 12 Anything further, Mr. Turner? 13 MR. TURNER: Two technical questions. 14 One, can I submit it electronically using the same 15 case filing that we did even though that's closed use? 16 MR. LUSKIN: I submitted my letter electronically, 17 your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Yes. Use ECF. 19 MR. TURNER: Okay, fine. 20 THE COURT: You can put it in letter form, but you 21 have to sign it, and the same goes for you, Mr. Fletcher. All 22 right? 23 MR. FLETCHER: Yes, your Honor. 24 MR. TURNER: And if I could get a copy of that --25 THE COURT: You will take it up with Mr. Mr. Luskin

Mr. Luskin. MR. LUSKIN: Show me what you are talking about. THE COURT: You will take it up after the proceedings conclude here. MR. LUSKIN: Thank you, your Honor. MR. TURNER: Thank you.